arXiv:1408.0310v3 [hep-ph] 19 Nov 2014

Improved Theory of Neutrino Oscillations in Matter

Leonard S. Kisslinger
Department of Physics, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh PA 15213 USA.

November 20, 2014

Abstract

This is revision of the S-Matrix theory of neutrino oscillations used for many years. We evaluate the transition probability of a μ to e neutrino without an approximation used for many theoretical studies, and find important differences which could improve the extraction of neutrino parameters from experimental data in the future.

.PACS Indices:11.30.Er,14.60.Lm,13.15.+g
Keywords: neutrino, neutrino oscillations, S-Matrix theory

1 Introduction

In previous research on neutrino oscillations we used S-Matrix theory with three active neutrinos to evaluate time reversal violation[1], CP violation[2], and recently[3] the transition probability $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$. One of the main objectives of Ref.[3] was to calculate neutrino oscillations and anti-electron neutrino disappearance to help in the measurement of θ_{13} from Daya Bay, Double Chooze, and RENO data. For this it is essential to have an accurate theory of neutrino transition probabilities.

Our previous research using S-Matrix theory with a 3×3 mixing matrix for three active neutrinos was based on earlier publications[4, 5, 6, 7]. In carrying out the evaluation of $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ we used an approximation for an important function, I_{α^*}, found in this earlier work, such as Ref[6], whose formulation we used. In the present work we evalute I_{α^*} exactly and find corrections to $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$. Our objective is to improve $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$, and thereby the extraction of important parameters from neutrino oscilation data.

2 $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ Derived Using S-Matrix Theory

Neutrinos are produced as ν_f, with f =flavor=e, μ, τ. Neutrinos with definite mass are ν_m, m=1,2,3. The flavor neutrinos are related to the neutrinos with definite mass by the 3×3 unitary matrix, U,

$$\nu_f \;\; = \;\; U \nu_m \; , \tag{1}$$

where ν_f, ν_m are 3×1 column vectors and U is ($sin\theta_{ij} \equiv s_{ij}$, etc).

$$U= \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta_{CP}} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{CP}} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{CP}} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{CP}} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta_{CP}} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix}$$

We use $c_{12} = .83,\ s_{12} = .56,\ s_{23} = c_{23} = .7071$, s_{13}= 0.19, and δ_{CP}=0.

The transition probability $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ is obtained from the S-Matrix element S_{12}, where $i\frac{d}{dt}S(t,t_0) = H(t)S(t,t_0)$, with $H(t)$ the Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e) \ = \ (Re[S_{12}])^2 + (Im[S_{12}])^2 \ . \tag{2}$$

From Ref[3]

$$\begin{aligned} Re[S12] &= s_{23}a[cos(\bar{\Delta}L)Im[I_{\alpha^*}] - sin(\bar{\Delta}L)Re[I_{\alpha^*}]] \\ Im[S12] &= -c_{23}sin2\theta sin\omega L - s_{23}a[cos(\bar{\Delta}L)Re[I_{\alpha^*}] \\ &\quad +sin(\bar{\Delta}L)Im[I_{\alpha^*}] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Delta} &= \Delta - (V+\delta)/2 \\ \Delta &= \delta m^2_{13}/(2E) \\ \delta &= \delta m^2_{12}/(2E) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where the neutrino mass differences are $\delta m^2_{12} = 7.6x10^{-5}(eV)^2$, $\delta m^2_{13} = 2.4x10^{-3}(eV)^2$, $sin2\theta = s_{12}c_{12}\frac{\delta}{\omega}$, $a = s_{13}(\Delta - s^2_{12}\delta)$, and E is the neutrino energy. Note that $t \to L$, where L is the baseline, for $v_\nu \simeq c$. The neutrino-matter potential $V = 1.13 \times 10^{-13}$ eV.

The main quantity of interest in our present work, I_{α^*}, is

$$I_{\alpha^*} \ = \ \int_0^t dt' \alpha^*(t') e^{-i\bar{\Delta}t'} \ , \tag{5}$$

with $\alpha(t) = cos(\omega t) - icos2\theta sin(\omega t)$, $\omega = \sqrt{\delta^2 + V^2 - 2\delta V cos(2\theta_{12})}/2$.

In Ref.[3], as in Ref.[6], one used $\delta, \omega \ll \Delta$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Re[I_{\alpha^*}] &\simeq sin\bar{\Delta}L/\bar{\Delta} \\ Im[I_{\alpha^*}] &\simeq (1 - cos\bar{\Delta}L)/\bar{\Delta} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

On the other hand if one uses Eq(5) to evaluate I_{α^*}, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} Re[I_{\alpha^*}] &= [(\omega - \bar{\Delta}cos2\theta)cos\bar{\Delta}Lsin\omega L \\ &\quad -(\bar{\Delta} - \omega cos2\theta)sin\bar{\Delta}Lcos\omega L]/(\omega^2 - \bar{\Delta}^2) \qquad (7) \\ Im[I_{\alpha^*}] &= [\bar{\Delta} + \omega cos2\theta - (\bar{\Delta} + \omega cos2\theta)cos\bar{\Delta}Lcos\omega L \\ &\quad -(\omega + \bar{\Delta}cos2\theta)sin\bar{\Delta}Lsin\omega L]/(\omega^2 - \bar{\Delta}^2). \qquad (8) \end{aligned}$$

From this we obtain an improved $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$= (Re$[S_{12}]$)^2 +(Im$[S_{12}]$)^2.

$\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ with old and precise $I_{\alpha^*}(E, L)$.



Figure 1: $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ for MINOS(L=735 km), MiniBooNE(L=500m), JHF-Kamioka(L=295 km), and CHOOZ(L=1.03 km) using the improved 3×3 mixing matrix. Solid curve for precise $I_{\alpha^*}(E, L)$ and dashed curve for approximate $I_{\alpha^*}(E, L)$. s_{13}=0.19

3 Conclusions

As one can see from the figure, for a large baseline (MINOS) or energy (MiniBooNE) the corrections are small. For some baselines and energies, including JHF-Kamioka and CHOOZ, the corrections to the neutrino transition probability $\mathcal{P}(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$ are large. This will modify the predictions of CP and T violation, and could have a large effect on the extraction of parameters via neutrino oscillations, such as s_{13} from $\mathcal{P}(\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e)$ by Daya Bay[8], Double Chooz[9], and, RENO[10]. This is an important result in neutrino physics, and the precise expression for I_{α^*} we have derived should be used for all future studies of neutrino oscillations.

Acknowledgements

This work was carried out while LSK was a visitor at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Group P25. The author thanks Dr. William Louis for information about recent and future neutrino oscillation experiments, and Dr. Mikkel B. Johnson for many helpful discussions.

References

[1] E.M. Henley, M.B. Johnson, and L.S. Kisslinger, arXiv:1102.5106/ hep-ph; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **E20**, 2453 (2011)

[2] E.M. Henley, M.B. Johnson, and L.S. Kisslinger, arXiv:1105.2741/ hep-ph (2011)

[3] Leonard S. Kisslinger, Ernest M. Henley, and Mikkel B. Johnson, arXiv:1203.6613/hep-ph; Int. J. Mod. Phys. E**21**, 1250065 (2012)

[4] J. Arafune and J. Sato, Phys. Rev. **D 55**, 1653 (1997)

[5] M. Freund, Phys. Rev. **D 64**, 053003 (2001)

[6] E. Akhmedov, P. Huber, M. Linder, and T. Ohlsson, Nucl. Phys **B 608**, 394 (2001)

[7] M. Jacobson and T. Ohlsson, Phys. Rev. **D 69**, 013003 (2004)

[8] F.P. An et.al., Daya Bay Collaboration, arXiv:1210.6327; Chin. Phys. **C37**, 01101 (2013)

[9] M. Kuze (Double Chooz Collaboration), arXiv:1109.0074/hep-ex (2011)

[10] J., K. Ahn, et.al. (RENO Collaboration), arXiv:1003.1391/hep-ex (2010)